arXiv:1305.0887v1 [math.PR] 4 May 2013

Reflected Backward Stochastic Difference Equations and Optimal Stopping Problems under g-expectation

Lifen An [*]   Samuel N. Cohen[†]   Shaolin Ji[‡]

May 7, 2013

Abstract: In this paper, we study reflected backward stochastic difference equations (RBSDEs for short) with finite state in discrete time. The existence and uniqueness result as well as the Comparison Theorem of solutions are established under mild assumptions. Then the connections between RBSDEs and optimal stopping time problemsare given. We finally apply the obtained results to explore the optimal stopping time problems under g-expectation.

AMS subject classifications: 60H10, 60G42

Keywords: backward stochastic difference equations (BSDEs), reflected BSDEs (RBSDEs), optimal stopping, g-expectation

1 Introduction

The theory of nonlinear backward stochastic differential equations was first introduced by Pardoux and Peng [27]. Over the past twenty years, backward stochastic differential equations are widely used in mathematical finance, stochastic control and other fields. By analogy with the equations in continuous time, Cohen and Elliott [9] considered the backward stochastic difference equations (BSDEs) on spaces related to discrete time, finite state processes. As entities in their own right, not as approximations to the continuous ones in [1, 3, 24], they established fundamental results including the comparison theorem etc. For deeper discussion, the readers may refer to [7–12].

The general theory of reflected backward stochastic differential equations was studied by El Karoui et al. [15]. They considered the case where the solution is forced to stay above a given stochastic process (called the obstacle) and introduced an increasing process which pushes the solution to remain above the obstacle. This important theory could be applied to the optimal

---

[*] School of Mathematics, Shandong University.

[†] University of Oxford, samuel.cohen@maths.ox.ac.uk.

[‡] Qilu Institute of Finance, Shandong University, jsl@sdu.edu.cn.

stopping problem (see [16]), some problems in finance markets and other related fields (see [2, 14, 19–23, 25]). So it is interesting to explore the reflected backward stochastic difference equations (RBSDEs for short) in the framework of [9], as well as some applications in optimal stopping time problems under g-expectation in discrete time.

The RBSDE is formulated in detail in section 2. To associate with the classical Skorohod problem as that in the continuous time case (see [15]), we first prove that the Skorohod lemma still holds in our framework. By Skorohod lemma, the increasing process is expressed as a supremum. Then we give the main results of this paper including the comparison theorem and the existence and uniqueness theorem. The proof of comparison theorem is similar to that for nonreflected BSDE's in [9]. The existence is established by penalization of the constraints. Moreover we show that the solution of RBSDE corresponds to the value of an optimal stopping time problem. We also show that the solution of the RBSDE in which the coefficient f is a concave (or convex) function is the value function of a mixed optimal stopping-optimal stochastic control problem.

With some limitations to the generator g, a BSDE is used to define a nonlinear expectation $\mathcal{E}^g[\xi] := Y_0$, which is called g-expectation (see [28]). A notable property of g-expectation is the time consistency, namely the conditional expectation $\mathcal{E}^g[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t]$ can be well-defined. Furthermore, it was proved that a dominated and time-consistent nonlinear expectation can be represented as the solution of a BSDE (see [13]). So it is interesting to study the optimal stopping problems under g-expectation. In section 3, we first study the g-expectation theory on spaces related to discrete time, finite state processes. The Doob-Mayer decomposition theorem and optional sampling theorem are obtained. Then we associate g-martingales with multiple prior martingales which were introduced by Riedel in [31]. We finally show that RBSDE is a convenient tool to solve some optimal stopping problems under g-expectation.

2 RBSDEs

Following [9], we consider an underlying discrete time, finite state process X which takes values in the standard basis vectors of R^m, where m is the number of states of the process X. In more details, for each $t \in \mathcal{N} \triangleq \{0, 1, 2, ..., T\}$, $X_t \in \{e_1, ..., e_m\}$, where $T > 0$ is a finite deterministic terminal time, $e_i = (0, 0, ..., 0, 1, 0, ..., 0)^* \in R^m$, and $[\cdot]^*$ denotes vector transposition.

Consider a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0 \le t \le T}, P)$, where $\mathcal{F}_t$ is the completion of the $\sigma-$algebra generated by the process X up to time t and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_T$.

Define

$$M_t = X_t - E[X_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}],\ t = 1, ..., T.$$

M is called the martingale difference process. We then have a representation of the process X in the following form

$$X_t = E[X_t \mid \mathcal{F}_{t-1}] + M_t,\ \ t = 1, ..., T.$$

The general form of a backward stochastic difference equation in [9] is for any $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$Y_t = \xi + \sum_{t \leq u < T} f(u, Y_u, Z_u) - \sum_{t \leq u < T} Z_u^* M_{u+1}, \qquad P - a.s. \tag{2.1}$$

where ξ is an R-valued $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable terminal condition and f an adapted map $f : \Omega \times \{0, 1, ..., T\} \times R \times R^m \to R$. The solution (Y_t, Z_t) is adapted to the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ and takes values in $R \times R^m$. We also assume that $(Y_t, Z_t) \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_t; R) \times L^1(\mathcal{F}_t; R^m)$for all t, $\xi \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T; R)$ and $f(t, y, z) \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_t; R)$ for all t and $(y, z) \in R \times R^m$. Note that since X_t only takes finite states, it is obvious that $L^1(\mathcal{F}_t; R^m) = L^\infty(\mathcal{F}_t; R^m)$.

By Theorem 2 in [9], the BSDE (2.1) has an adapted solution (Y_t, Z_t) if f satisfies the following two assumptions:
(*A1*) For any Y, if $Z^1 \sim_M Z^2$, then $f(t, Y_t, Z_t^1) = f(t, Y_t, Z_t^2)$ P-*a.s.* for all t;
(*A2*) For any $z \in R^m$, for all t, for P-almost all ω, the map

$$y \mapsto y - f(t, y, z)$$

is a bijection $R \to R$.

Moreover, this solution is unique up to indistinguishability for Y and $\sim_M$ for Z. $Z^1 \sim_M Z^2$ is defined by $\|Z^1 - Z^2\|_M^2 = 0$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z\|_M^2 &\triangleq ETr[\sum_{0 \leq u < T} Z_u^* \cdot E[M_{u+1} M_{u+1}^* | \mathcal{F}_u] \cdot Z_u] \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq u < T} TrE[(Z_u^* M_{u+1})(Z_u^* M_{u+1})^*]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we study RBSDEs.

Definition 2.1 *A triple (ξ, f, S) is called a standard data if*

*(*i*) $\xi \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T; R)$;*

*(*ii*) The map $f(\cdot, y, z)$ is an adapted process for any $(y, z) \in R \times R^m$;*

*(*iii*) The obstacle process $\{S_t, 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is real-valued and adapted such that $S_T \leq \xi$ P-a.s.*

Definition 2.2 *A solution of RBSDE with standard data (ξ, f, S) is a triple $\{(Y_t, Z_t, K_t), 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ of adapted processes taking values in $R \times R^m \times R$ such that $\forall 0 \leq t \leq T$,*

*(*i*)*

$$Y_t = \xi + \sum_{t \leq u < T} f(u, Y_u, Z_u) + K_T - K_t - \sum_{t \leq u < T} Z_u^* M_{u+1}, \ P - a.s.; \tag{2.2}$$

*(*ii*) $Y_t \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_t; R), Z_t \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_t; R^m)$ and $K_t \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_t; R)$;*

*(*iii*) $Y_t \geq S_t$ $P - a.s.$;*

*(*iv*) $\{K_t\}$ is increasing, $K_0 = 0$ and*

$$\sum_{0 \leq t \leq T} (Y_t - S_t)(K_{t+1} - K_t) = 0, \ P - a.s.$$

2.1 Skorohod lemma and a priori estimate

We first consider the Skorohod problem (see [30]) in the discrete time case.

Lemma 2.3 *Let y be a real-valued function on $\{0,1,...,T\}$ such that $y(0)\geq 0$. There exists a unique pair (v,g) of functions on $\{0,1,...,T\}$ such that $\forall t\in\{0,1,...,T\}$,*

*(*i*) $v(t)=y(t)+g(t)$;*

*(*ii*) $v(t)$ is non-negative;*

*(*iii*) $g(t)$ is increasing, vanishing at zero and*

$$\sum_{1\leq t\leq T} v(t)(g(t)-g(t-1))=0.$$

The function g is moreover given by

$$g(t)=\sup_{s\leq t}(-y(s)\vee 0).$$

Proof. We first claim that the pair (g,v) defined by

$$g(t)=\sup_{s\leq t}(-y(s)\vee 0), v(t)=y(t)+g(t)$$

satisfies properties (i) through (iii).

To prove the uniqueness of the pair (g,v), we suppose that $(\hat{g},\hat{v})$ is another pair which satisfies (i) through (iii). Then $v-\hat{v}=g-\hat{g}$. Note that $g(0)=\hat{g}(0)=0$ and consequently $v(0)-\hat{v}(0)=0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
(v(t)-\hat{v}(t))^2 &= \sum_{1\leq s\leq t}[(v(s)-\hat{v}(s))^2-(v(s-1)-\hat{v}(s-1))^2]\\
&= \sum_{1\leq s\leq t}[(v(s)-\hat{v}(s))+(v(s-1)-\hat{v}(s-1))][(g(s)-\hat{g}(s))\\
&\quad -(g(s-1)-\hat{g}(s-1))]\\
&= \sum_{1\leq s\leq t}(v(s)-\hat{v}(s))[(g(s)-\hat{g}(s))-(g(s-1)-\hat{g}(s-1))]\\
&\quad +\sum_{1\leq s\leq t}(g(s-1)-\hat{g}(s-1))(g(s)-\hat{g}(s))-\sum_{1\leq s\leq t}(g(s-1)-\hat{g}(s-1))^2\\
&= -\sum_{1\leq s\leq t}v(s)(\hat{g}(s)-\hat{g}(s-1))-\sum_{1\leq s\leq t}\hat{v}(s)(g(s)-g(s-1))\\
&\quad -\sum_{1\leq s\leq t}(g(s-1)-\hat{g}(s-1))^2+\sum_{1\leq s\leq t}(g(s)-\hat{g}(s))(g(s-1)-\hat{g}(s-1))\\
&\leq -\sum_{1\leq s\leq t}v(s)(\hat{g}(s)-\hat{g}(s-1))-\sum_{1\leq s\leq t}\hat{v}(s)(g(s)-g(s-1))\\
&\quad -\sum_{1\leq s\leq t}\frac{(g(s-1)-\hat{g}(s-1))^2}{2}+\sum_{1\leq s\leq t}\frac{(g(s)-\hat{g}(s))^2}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By $v-\hat{v}=g-\hat{g}$, we have that

$$\frac{(v(t)-\hat{v}(t))^2}{2} \leq -\sum_{1\leq s\leq t} v(s)(\hat{g}(s)-\hat{g}(s-1)) - \sum_{1\leq s\leq t} \hat{v}(s)(g(s)-g(s-1)) \leq 0.$$

Hence $v(t)=\hat{v}(t)$ and consequently $g(t)=\hat{g}(t)$. ■

Due to Lemma 2.3, we obtain the following estimation.

Proposition 2.4 *Let $\{(Y_t, Z_t, K_t), 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ be a solution of the RBSDE (2.2). Then for each $t \in \{0,1,...,T\}$,*

$$K_T - K_t = \underset{t\leq u\leq T}{ess\sup}(\xi + \sum_{u\leq s<T} f(s,Y_s,Z_s) - \sum_{u\leq s<T} Z_s^* M_{s+1} - S_u)^-.$$

Proof. Set

$$y_t = \xi + \sum_{T-t\leq s<T} f(s,Y_s,Z_s) - \sum_{T-t\leq s<T} Z_s^* M_{s+1} - S_{T-t}.$$

Then $y_0 = \xi - S_T \geq 0$. Notice that

$$Y_{T-t}(\omega) - S_{T-t}(\omega) = y_t + K_T(\omega) - K_{T-t}(\omega).$$

By Lemma 2.3, we know that $(Y_{T-t}(\omega) - S_{T-t}(\omega), K_T(\omega) - K_{T-t}(\omega)), 0 \leq t \leq T$ is the unique solution of the above Skorohod problem. Moreover,

$$K_T - K_{T-t} = \underset{0\leq u\leq t}{\operatorname{ess\,sup}}(\xi + \sum_{T-u\leq s<T} f(s,Y_s,Z_s) - \sum_{T-u\leq s<T} Z_s^* M_{s+1} - S_{T-u})^-.$$

This completes the proof. ■

2.2 Comparison theorem

We now present a comparison theorem for RBSDEs. Given $\mathcal{F}_t$, let $\mathcal{Q}_t$ denote the $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable set of indices of possible values of X_{t+1}, *i.e.*

$$\mathcal{Q}_t \triangleq \{i : P(X_{t+1} = e_i \mid \mathcal{F}_t) > 0\}.$$

Theorem 2.5 (Comparison Theorem) *Consider two RBSDEs with standard data (ξ^1, f^1, S^1) and (ξ^2, f^2, S^2) respectively. Let (Y^1, Z^1, K^1) and (Y^2, Z^2, K^2) be the associated solutions. Suppose the following conditions hold:*

*(*i*) $\xi^1 \geq \xi^2$, P-a.s.;*

*(*ii*) $f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) \geq f^2(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2)$ $P-a.s.$for all t;*

*(*iii*) $S_t^1 \geq S_t^2$, P-a.s.;*

*(*iv*) $f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^1) - f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) \geq \min_{i\in\mathcal{Q}_t}\{(Z_t^1 - Z_t^2)^*(e_i - E[X_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t])\}$, $P-a.s.$ for all t;*

*(*v*) if $Y_t^1 - f^1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) \geq Y_t^2 - f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^1)$ $P-a.s.$ for all t, then $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$ $P-a.s.$*

Then it is true that

$$Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2 \quad P-a.s.$$

Proof. It is clear that $Y_t^1 - Y_t^2 = \xi^1 - \xi^2 \geq 0 \ P - a.s.$ For an arbitrary $0 \leq t < T$, suppose that $Y_{t+1}^1 - Y_{t+1}^2 \geq 0 \ P - a.s.$ Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & Y_{t+1}^1 - Y_{t+1}^2 \\ = \ & Y_t^1 - Y_t^2 - f^1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) + f^2(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) + (Z_t^1 - Z_t^2)^* M_{t+1} \\ & -(K_{t+1}^1 - K_t^1) + (K_{t+1}^2 - K_t^2) \\ \geq \ & 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Since $M_{t+1} = X_{t+1} - E[X_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t]$ and X_{t+1} takes values in the standard basis vectors of R^m,

$$\begin{aligned} & Y_t^1 - Y_t^2 - (K_{t+1}^1 - K_t^1) + (K_{t+1}^2 - K_t^2) \\ \geq \ & f^1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) - f^2(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) - \min_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_t} \{(Z_t^1 - Z_t^2)^*(e_i - E[X_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t)\}. \end{aligned}$$

By assumptions (ii) and (iv), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & Y_t^1 - Y_t^2 - f^1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) + f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^1) - (K_{t+1}^1 - K_t^1) + (K_{t+1}^2 - K_t^2) \\ \geq \ & f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) - f^2(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) + f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^1) - f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) \\ & -\min_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_t} \{(Z_t^1 - Z_t^2)^*(e_i - E[X_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t])\} \\ \geq \ & 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Set

$$\mathcal{A} \triangleq \{\omega \mid Y_t^1(\omega) < Y_t^2(\omega)\}.$$

We know that$S_t^2 \leq S_t^1 \leq Y_t^1 < Y_t^2$ on $\mathcal{A}$ which yields that$K_{t+1}^2 - K_t^2 = 0$ on $\mathcal{A}$.so

$$Y_t^1 - Y_t^2 - f^1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) + f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^1) \geq 0 \text{ on } \mathcal{A}.$$

But by assumption (v), the above inequality implies

$$Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2 \quad \text{on } \mathcal{A}.$$

Thus, we deduce that $P(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ and

$$Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2 \quad P - a.s.$$

This completes the proof. ■

Remark 2.6 *If the map* $y - f(t, y, z)$ *is strictly increasing in* y *for all* t*, then the assumption* (v) *holds.*

Corollary 2.7 *The assumptions are the same as in Theorem 2.5. If we also know* $Y_t^1 = Y_t^2$*, then* $K_t^1 \leq K_t^2 \ P - a.s.$ *for all* $t \in \{0, 1, ..., T\}$ *and* $K_t^1 - K_t^2$ *is decreasing in* t*. Moreover, if* $\xi^1 = \xi^2, f^1 = f^2 \ P - a.s.$*, then* $K_t^1 = K_t^2 \ P - a.s.$ *for all* $t \in \{0, 1, ..., T\}$*.*

Proof. By (2.4), we have

$$K^1_{t+1} - K^1_t \le K^2_{t+1} - K^2_t.$$

Then

$$K^1_{t+1} - K^2_{t+1} \le K^1_t - K^2_t.$$

It is obvious that $K^1_t - K^2_t$ is decreasing in t. Since $K^1_0 = K^2_0 = 0$, we obtain that $K^1_t \le K^2_t$ $P - a.s.$

Moreover, if we also have $\xi^1 = \xi^2, f^1 = f^2$ $P - a.s.$, then it is easy to see that

$$K^2_t \le K^1_t \ P - a.s.$$

This completes the proof. ■

The following example shows that Theorem 2.5 fails when the assumption (*iv*) does not hold.

Example 2.8 *For simplicity, suppose* $T = 1$. *Consider two RBSDEs with standard data* (ξ^1, f^1, S^1) *and* (ξ^2, f^2, S^2) *respectively which satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 2.11 in the following section. Let* $\xi^1 = \xi^2$, $f^1 = f^2 = f$ *and* $S^1 = S^2$ *and the map* $y - f(y, z)$ *is strictly increasing in* y. *By Theorem 2.11, we have* $Y^1_0 = Y^2_0$, $K^1_0 = K^2_0$ *and* $K^1_1 = K^2_1$ $P - a.s.$

Suppose the assumption (iv) *of Theorem 2.5 does not hold. In particular, we have*

$$f(0, Y^2_0, Z^1_0) - f(0, Y^2_0, Z^2_0) < \min_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_t} \{(Z^1_0 - Z^2_0)^*(e_i - E[X_1 \mid \mathcal{F}_0])\}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \ & Y^1_1 - Y^2_1 \\ = \ & Y^1_0 - Y^2_0 - f(0, Y^1_0, Z^1_0) + f(0, Y^2_0, Z^2_0) + (Z^1_0 - Z^2_0)^* M_1 \\ & -(K^1_1 - K^1_0) + (K^2_1 - K^2_0) \\ > \ & Y^1_0 - Y^2_0 - f(0, Y^1_0, Z^1_0) + f(0, Y^2_0, Z^1_0) - (K^1_1 - K^1_0) + (K^2_1 - K^2_0). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \ & (K^1_1 - K^1_0) - (K^2_1 - K^2_0) \\ > \ & Y^1_0 - Y^2_0 - f(0, Y^1_0, Z^1_0) + f(0, Y^2_0, Z^1_0). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the map $y - f(y, z)$ *is strictly increasing in* y. *Thus, we deduce* $Y^1_0 < Y^2_0$, *contradicting the conclusion of Theorem 2.5.*

2.3 Existence and uniqueness

In this subsection, we will explore the existence and uniqueness of solutions of RBSDE basing on approximation via penalization in [15] as well as the comparison theorem obtained in [9].

Firstly, we recall the comparison theorem in [9].

Theorem 2.9 *Consider two BSDEs (2.1) with standard data* (ξ^1, f^1) *and* (ξ^2, f^2) *respectively. Suppose* (Y^1, Z^1) *and* (Y^2, Z^2) *are the associated solutions, and the following conditions also hold: for all* $t \in \{0, 1, ..., T\}$,

*(*i*)* $\xi^1 \geq \xi^2$ $P-a.s.$;

*(*ii*)* $f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) \geq f^2(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2)$, $P-a.s.$;

*(*iii*)* $f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^1) - f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^2) \geq \min_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_t} \{[Z_t^1 - Z_t^2]^*(e_i - E[X_{t+1} \mid \mathcal{F}_t])\}$ $P-a.s.$;

*(*iv*) if* $Y_t^1 - f^1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) \geq Y_t^2 - f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^1)$ $P-a.s.$, *then* $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$.

Then it is true that

$$Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2 \quad P-a.s.$$

Corollary 2.10 *Suppose Theorem 2.9 holds. Furthermore, if the inequalities in Theorem 2.9 are strict, then we have* $Y_t^1 > Y_t^2$ $P-a.s.$

Proof. By Theorem 2.9, we have $Y_t^1 \geq Y_t^2$ $P-a.s.$ Then, by the same arguments as in Theorem 2.5, we obtain

$$Y_t^1 - Y_t^2 - f^1(t, Y_t^1, Z_t^1) + f^1(t, Y_t^2, Z_t^1) > 0.$$

It follows that $Y_t^1 > Y_t^2$ $P-a.s.$This completes the proof. ■

Theorem 2.11 *Consider a RBSDE (2.2) with standard data* (ξ, f, S). *The map* f *satisfies the following two assumptions:*

*(*i*) For any* Y, *if* $Z^1 \sim_M Z^2$, *then* $f(t, Y_t, Z_t^1) = f(t, Y_t, Z_t^2)$ $P-a.s.$*for all* t.

*(*ii*) For any* $z \in R^m$, *for all* t, *the map* $y - f(t, y, z)$ *is strictly increasing and continuous in* y $P-a.s.$

Then there exists an adapted solution (Y, Z, K) *for RBSDE (2.2). Moreover, this solution is unique up to indistinguishability for* Y *and equivalence* $\sim_M$ *for* Z.

Proof. It is clear that the solution $Y_T = \xi$ at time T. Then we construct the solution for all t using backward induction. Without loss of generality, we only consider the following one-step RBSDE as follows:

$$Y_t = Y_{t+1} + f(t, Y_t, Z_t) + K_{t+1} - K_t - Z_t^* M_{t+1}. \tag{2.5}$$

(1) Existence. We divide the proof into two steps. In the first step, we construct a sequence of BSDEs and prove the convergence of the corresponding solutions. We prove that the limit obtained in Step 1 is a solution of (2.2) in the second step.

Step 1. Considering the following sequence of BSDEs :

$$Y_t^n = Y_{t+1} + f(t, Y_t^n, Z_t^n) + n(Y_t^n - S_t)^- - (Z_t^n)^* M_{t+1}, \quad n \in \mathcal{Z}^+ \tag{2.6}$$

where $\mathcal{Z}^+$ is the set of positive integers. Taking conditional expectation for (2.6), we get

$$Y_t^n = E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] + f(t, Y_t^n, Z_t^n) + n(Y_t^n - S_t)^-, \quad n \in \mathcal{Z}^+. \tag{2.7}$$

Hence,

$$(Z_t^n)^* M_{t+1} = Y_{t+1} - E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t].$$

By Martingale Representation Theorem in [18], there exists a unique Z_t up to equivalence $\sim_{M_{t+1}}$ such that the above equation is satisfied for an arbitrary n. Using this Z_t, (2.7) can be rewritten as follows:

$$Y_t^n = Y_{t+1} + f(t, Y_t^n, Z_t) + n(Y_t^n - S_t)^- - Z_t^* M_{t+1}, \quad n \in \mathcal{Z}^+. \tag{2.8}$$

Let

$$f_n(t, y, z) = f(t, y, z) + n(y - S_t)^-.$$

Then $y - f_n(t, y, z)$ is strictly increasing and continuous in y. By theorem 2.9, (2.8) has a unique solution (Y_t^n, Z_t). It is clear that

(i) $f_{n+1}(t, y, z) \geq f_n(t, y, z), \quad \forall (y, z) \in R \times R^m$;

(ii) Note that $Z_t^n = Z_t^{n+1} = Z_t$. We have that $f(t, Y_t, Z_t^n) - f(t, Y_t, Z_t^{n+1}) = 0 = \min_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_t} \{[Z_t^n - Z_t^{n+1}]^* (e_i - E[X_{t+1}]\}$;

(iii) Since the map $y - f_n(t, y, z)$ is strictly increasing, we obtain that if

$$y_1 - f_n(t, y_1, z) \geq y_2 - f_n(t, y_2, z),$$

then $y_1 \geq y_2$ $P - a.s.$

Therefore, by the Comparison Theorem 2.9, we obtain that $Y_t^{n+1} \geq Y_t^n$ $P - a.s.$Thus,

$$Y_t^n \uparrow Y_t \quad P - a.s.$$

From (2.7), on the event $\{Y_t^n \geq S_t\}$, $Y_t^n = E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] + f(t, Y_t^n, Z_t)$. Because the map $y - f(t, y, z)$ is strictly increasing, we deduce that Y_t^n is essentially bounded on $\{Y_t^n \geq S_t\}$. On the event $\{Y_t^n < S_t\}$,

$$Y_t^n - f(t, Y_t^n, Z_t) = E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] + n(S_t - Y_t^n).$$

Since $y - f(t, y, z)$ is strictly increasing and $n(S_t - Y_t^n) \geq 0$on $\{Y_t^n < S_t\}$, there exists a lower bound for Y_t^n on this event. Thus, from Fatou's Lemma

$$E \mid Y_t \mid \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} E \mid Y_t^n \mid < \infty.$$

Set

$$\triangle K_t^n = n(Y_t^n - S_t)^-.$$

By (2.7), we have

$$|\triangle K_t^{n+p} - \triangle K_t^n| \leq | f(t, Y_t^{n+p}, Z_t) - f(t, Y_t^n, Z_t) | + | Y_t^{n+p} - Y_t^n |, \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{Z}^+.$$

Since f is continuous in y and $Y_t^n \uparrow Y_t$ $P-a.s.$It leads to

$$|\triangle K_t^{n+p} - \triangle K_t^n| \to 0, \quad n \to +\infty.$$

Consequently there exists a process $\triangle K_t$ such that $\triangle K_t^n \to \triangle K_t$, as $n \to \infty$. Define

$$K_0 = 0, \text{ and } K_t = \sum_{0 \leq u < t-1} \triangle K_u.$$

Then as $n \to \infty$, (2.8) becomes

$$Y_t = Y_{t+1} + f(t, Y_t, Z_t) + K_{t+1} - K_t - Z_t^* M_{t+1}.$$

Step 2. It is obvious that the obtained (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) satisfies *(i)* and *(ii)* of Definition 2.2. It remains to check *(iii)* and *(iv)*.

First of all, K_t is increasing since $\triangle K_t$is non-negative. As

$$(Y_t^n - S_t) \triangle K_t^n = n(Y_t^n - S_t)(Y_t^n - S_t)^- = -n[(Y_t^n - S_t)^-]^2 \leq 0,$$

then

$$(Y_t - S_t)(K_{t+1} - K_t) \leq 0.$$

On the other hand,

$$(Y_t^{n+1} - S_t)^- \leq (Y_t^n - S_t)^-.$$

By (2.7), we have

$$(Y_t^n - S_t)^- = \frac{Y_t^n - E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] - f(t, Y_t^n, Z_t)}{n}.$$

Then, as $n \to \infty$,

$$(Y_t^n - S_t)^- \downarrow 0 \text{ and } \quad (Y_t - S_t)^- = \lim_{n \to +\infty} (Y_t^n - S_t)^- = 0.$$

It follows that $Y_t \geq S_t$. Hence

$$(Y_t - S_t)(K_{t+1} - K_t) \geq 0 \quad P-a.s..$$

Thus, we obtain $(Y_t - S_t)(K_{t+1} - K_t) = 0$ $P-a.s.$

(2) Uniqueness. Suppose that there exist two solutions (Y_t, Z_t, K_t) and (Y'_t, Z'_t, K'_t) of RBSDE (2.5). Without loss of generality, suppose $Y_t > Y'_t$. Then $Y_t > Y'_t \geq S_t$. It follows that $K_{t+1} - K_t = 0$ and (2.5) can be simplified to

$$Y_t = Y_{t+1} + f(t, Y_t, Z_t) - Z_t^* M_{t+1}.$$

On the other hand,

$$Y'_t = Y_{t+1} + f(t, Y'_t, Z'_t) + K'_{t+1} - K'_t - Z_t'^* M_{t+1}.$$

By Theorem 2.9, we have $Y_t \leq Y'_t \ P - a.s.$This leads to contradiction. Thus, we have $Y_t = Y'_t \ P - a.s.$

By Corollary 2.7, we have $K_t = K'_t$, $K_{t+1} = K'_{t+1}$.

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Z_t'^* M_{t+1} &= Y_{t+1} - E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] + K'_{t+1} - K'_t - E[K'_{t+1} - K'_t|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= Y_{t+1} - E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] + K_{t+1} - K_t - E[K_{t+1} - K_t|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= Z_t^* M_{t+1} \end{aligned}$$

Then by Martingale Representation Theorem, we have $Z_t \sim_M Z'_t$. ■

Remark 2.12 *If the map f is strictly decreasing and continuous in y, then the theorem still holds.*

2.4 Relation with optimal stopping time problems

Now we show that the solution (Y_t) of the RBSDE (2.2) corresponds to the value of an optimal stopping time problem.

Proposition 2.13 *Let $\{(Y_t, Z_t, K_t), 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ be a solution of the RBSDE (2.2). Then for each $t \in \{0, 1, ..., T\}$,*

$$Y_t = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\theta \in \mathcal{J}_t} E[\sum_{t \leq s < \theta} f(s, Y_s, Z_s) + S_\theta 1_{\{\theta < T\}} + \xi 1_{\{\theta = T\}}|\mathcal{F}_t],$$

where $\mathcal{J}$ is the set of all stopping times dominated by T and $\mathcal{J}_t \triangleq \{\theta \in \mathcal{J}; t \leq \theta \leq T\}$.

Proof. For a given stopping time $\theta \in \mathcal{J}_t$, we have

$$Y_t = Y_\theta + \sum_{t \leq u < \theta} f(u, Y_u, Z_u) + K_\theta - K_t - \sum_{t \leq u < \theta} Z_u^* M_{u+1}, \qquad 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Taking the conditional expectation,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t &= E[Y_\theta + \sum_{t\le u<\theta} f(u, Y_u, Z_u) + K_\theta - K_t|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &\ge E[\sum_{t\le u<\theta} f(u, Y_u, Z_u) + S_\theta 1_{\{\theta<T\}} + \xi 1_{\{\theta=T\}}|\mathcal{F}_t]. \end{aligned}$$

In order to obtain the reversed inequality, we define

$$D_t = \begin{cases} T, & \text{if for any } t \le u \le T,\ Y_u > S_u; \\ \inf\limits_u \{t \le u \le T \mid Y_u = S_u\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that $\sum_{0\le t\le T}(Y_t - S_t)(K_{t+1} - K_t) = 0$ implies for any $t + 1 \le s \le D_t$,

$$K_s - K_{s-1} = 0.$$

Then

$$K_{D_t} - K_t = \sum_{t+1\le s\le D_t} (K_s - K_{s-1}) = 0, \quad 0 \le t \le T.$$

It leads to

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t &= E[Y_{D_t} + \sum_{t\le u<D_t} f(u, Y_u, Z_u) + K_{D_t} - K_t|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= E[Y_{D_t} + \sum_{t\le u<D_t} f(u, Y_u, Z_u)|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &\le \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\theta\in\mathcal{J}_t} E[\sum_{t\le u<\theta} f(u, Y_u, Z_u) + S_\theta 1_{\{\theta<T\}} + \xi 1_{\{\theta=T\}}|\mathcal{F}_t]. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. ■

Example 2.14 *Set $L_t = \sum_{t\le u<T} Z_u^* M_{u+1}$. Consider the special case: $f = C, S_T = \xi \ge 0$ where C is a constant. If (Y, Z) is a solution, then*

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0 &= E[\xi + CT + K_T] \\ &= E[\xi + \operatorname*{\mathit{ess}\,sup}_{0\le t\le T}(S_t + L_t - C(T - t) - \xi)^+]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $S_T = \xi$, it is easy to check that

$$Y_0 = \sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{J}_0} E[S_\theta + C\theta] = E[\operatorname*{\mathit{ess}\,sup}_{0\le t\le T}(S_t + L_t + Ct)].$$

When $C = 0$, we have

$$Y_0 = \sup_{\theta\in\mathcal{J}_0} E[S_\theta] = E[\operatorname*{\mathit{ess}\,sup}_{0\le t\le T}(S_t + L_t)].$$

By proposition 2.13, the solution of the RBSDE in which f is a given stochastic process is the value function of an optimal stopping time problem. In the following, we shall investigate the cases where $f(t,y,z)$ is a linear function or concave (convex) function. In the latter case, the solution $\{Y_t, 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ is shown to be the value function of a mixed optimal stopping–optimal stochastic control problem. Note that El.Karoui et al. [15] studied the similar problems for the reflected backward stochastic differential equations.

Without loss of generality, we only consider the one-step RBSDE in our framework, i.e.

$$Y_t = Y_{t+1} + f(t, Y_t, Z_t) - Z_t^* M_{t+1} + K_{t+1} - K_t, 0 \leq t < T. \tag{2.9}$$

Throughout this subsection, we need the following assumption:

Assumption (H)**:** if $Z^1 \sim_M Z^2$, then $Z^1 = Z^2$ $P - a.s.$

Remark 2.15 *Actually there are many processes* X_t *satisfying the Assumption* (H) *such as the standard random walk etc.*

By proposition 2.13, we have the following results.

Proposition 2.16 *Consider the RBSDE (2.2) with coefficient* $f = \alpha_t$, *where* $\{\alpha_t; 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ *is a given adapted process and takes values in* R. *Then the unique solution* (Y, Z, K) *satisfies*

$$Y_t = ess \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{J}_t} E[\sum_{t \leq s < \theta} \alpha_s + S_\theta I_{\{\theta < T\}} + \xi I_{\{\theta = T\}} | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

Moreover, if we consider equation (2.9), then we have

$$Y_t = S_t \vee (\alpha_t + E[Y_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t]). \tag{2.10}$$

In fact, we can directly obtain (2.10) by Definition 2.2. Denote

$$\rho_t = \alpha_t + E[Y_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

Taking the conditional expectation for (2.9), we have

$$Y_t = \rho_t + E[K_{t+1} - K_t | \mathcal{F}_t].$$

There are three cases:

(i) $\rho_t > S_t$. By the condition *(iv)* of Definition 2.2, it follows that $K_{t+1} - K_t = 0$. Then $Y_t = \rho_t$.

(ii) $\rho_t = S_t$. Then $Y_t - S_t = E[K_{t+1} - K_t | \mathcal{F}_t]$. Since K is an increasing process, we have $K_{t+1} - K_t = 0$. Thus, $Y_t = \rho_t = S_t$.

(iii) $\rho_t < S_t$. It follows that $K_{t+1} - K_t > 0$. Then, we have $Y_t = S_t$.

To sum up, $Y_t = S_t \vee \rho_t$, i.e. $Y_t = S_t \vee (\alpha_t + E[Y_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t])$.

Let $\{\alpha_t, \beta_t, \gamma_t, 0 \leq t \leq T\}$ be adapted processes taking values in $R \times [0,1) \times R^m$.

Proposition 2.17 *Under Assumption (H), consider the RBSDE (2.9) with the coefficient*

$$f(t,y,z)=\alpha_t+\beta_t y+<\gamma_t,z>.$$

Then the solution (Y,Z,K) satisfies

$$Y_t=S_t\vee(\alpha_t+\beta_t Y_t+<\gamma_t,Z_t>+E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]). \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. It is easy to check that the solution (Y,Z,K) is unique. Then by Proposition 2.16, we obtain (2.11). Note that Z_t satisfies that $Z_t^*M_{t+1}=Y_{t+1}-E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]$ from the proof of Theorem 2.11. Thus, we only need to solve the equation

$$Y_t=\alpha_t+\beta_t Y_t+<\gamma_t,Z_t>+E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t],$$

i.e.,

$$(1-\beta_t)Y_t=\alpha_t+<\gamma_t,Z_t>+E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t].$$

If the obtained solution $Y_t>S_t$ $P-a.s.$, then this solution is desired; otherwise, $Y_t=S_t$ $P-a.s.$ ■

Remark 2.18 *If $\beta_t=1$, then*

$$y-f(t,y,z)=-\alpha_t-<\gamma_t,z>$$

which violates the assumption (ii) *of Theorem 2 in [9]. Thus, we can not guarantee that there exists a unique solution of the linear RBSDE.*

We now suppose that for each fixed (ω,t), $f(t,y,z)$ is a concave function of (y,z). For each $(\omega,t,\beta,\gamma)\in\Omega\times\{0,1,...,T\}\times R\times R^m$, define the conjugate function $F(t,\beta,\gamma)$ as follows:

$$F(\omega,t,\beta,\gamma)=\sup_{(y,z)}(f(t,y,z)-\beta y-<\gamma,z>)$$

$$D_t^F(\omega)=\{(\beta,\gamma)\in R\times R^m;F(\omega,t,\beta,\gamma)<\infty\}.$$

It follows that

$$f(t,y,z)=\inf_{(\beta,\gamma)\in D_t^F}\{F(t,\beta,\gamma)+\beta y+<\gamma,z>\},$$

the infimum is achieved at $(\beta',\gamma')\in D_t^F$ and the set D_t^F is a.s. bounded (refer to [17]).

Denote the solution of RBSDE with coefficient $f^{\beta,\gamma}(t,y,z)=F(t,\beta_t,\gamma_t)+\beta_t y+<\gamma_t,z>$ ($f(t,y,z)$ resp.) by $\{(Y_t^{\beta,\gamma},Z_t^{\beta,\gamma},K_t^{\beta,\gamma});0\le t\le T\}$ ($\{(Y_t,Z_t,K_t);0\le t\le T\}$ resp.). Consequently we have

$$f(t,Y_t,Z_t)=F(t,\beta',\gamma')+\beta' Y_t+<\gamma',Z_t>\quad P-a.s.;$$
$$(Y_t,Z_t,K_t)=(Y_t^{\beta',\gamma'},Z_t^{\beta',\gamma'},K_t^{\beta',\gamma'})\quad P-a.s.,0\le t\le T.$$

Then $Y_t=Y_t^{\beta',\gamma'}$ can be interpreted as the value functions of an optimization problem.

Theorem 2.19 *Under (H), for each $(\beta_t,\gamma_t)\in D_t^F$ and $|\beta_t|<1$ $P-a.s.$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}Y_t^{\beta,\gamma} &= S_t\vee(F(t,\beta_t,\gamma_t)+\beta_t Y_t^{\beta,\gamma}+<\gamma_t,Z_t>+E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]);\\ Y_t &= S_t\vee(F(t,\beta'_t,\gamma'_t)+\beta_t Y_t+<\gamma'_t,Z_t>+E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}Y_t &= ess\inf_{(\beta,\gamma)\in D_t^F} Y_t^{\beta,\gamma}\\ &= ess\inf_{(\beta,\gamma)\in D_t^F}(S_t\vee(F(t,\beta_t,\gamma_t)+\beta_t Y_t^{\beta,\gamma}+<\gamma_t,Z_t>+E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]))\\ &= S_t\vee ess\inf_{(\beta,\gamma)\in D_t^F}(F(t,\beta_t,\gamma_t)+\beta_t Y_t^{\beta,\gamma}+<\gamma_t,Z_t>+E[Y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]).\end{aligned}$$

In other words, Y_t is the value function of a minimax control problem, and the triple (β',γ',D_t), where $D_t=\inf\{t\le s\le T;Y_s=S_s\}$ is optimal.

Proof. The first statement is obvious by Proposition 2.17.

By Comparison Theorem 2.5, we have

$$Y_t\le Y_t^{\beta,\gamma},\quad \forall(\beta,\gamma)\in D_t^F.$$

On the other hand,

$$Y_t=Y_t^{\beta',\gamma'}\ge\inf_{(\beta,\gamma)\in D_t^F}Y_t^{\beta,\gamma},$$

which immediately leads to

$$Y_t=ess\inf_{(\beta,\gamma)\in D_t^F}Y_t^{\beta,\gamma}.$$

At last, it is easy to see that the operators $ess\inf$ and $\vee$ can be exchanged. ■

Remark 2.20 *If f is a convex function of (y,z), we have a similar representation of Y_t.*

3 Optimal stopping problems under g-expectation

In order to study the optimal stopping problems under g-expectation, we first study the g-expectation theory on spaces related to discrete time, finite state processes. Then we give the connection between multiple prior martingales and g-martingales. At last, we show that some optimal stopping problems with multiple priors can be solved by computing the corresponding RBSDEs.

3.1 g-expectation

Peng [28] and [29] introduced the notions of g-expectation and conditional g-expectation as well as g-martingale via backward stochastic differential equations. This section is aim to study the g-expectation theory in our framework.

We assume:

$(A3)$: $f(0,0,t)=0$, for all $t\in\{0,1,...,T\}$.

Definition 3.1 *For each* $\xi\in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T;R)$*, suppose that the map* f *satisfies Assumptions* $(A1)-(A3)$*.* (Y_t,Z_t) *is the solution of BSDE (2.1). We call* $G_{0,T}(\xi)$ *defined by*

$$G_{0,T}(\xi)\triangleq Y_0$$

the g-expectation of the random variable ξ *generated by* f*.*

The conditional g-expectation is defined as follows.

Theorem 3.2 *For given* $\xi\in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T;R)$ *and* $r\in\{0,1,...,T\}$*, there exists a* $\eta\in L^1(\mathcal{F}_r;R)$ *such that* $\forall A\in\mathcal{F}_r$*,*

$$G_{0,T}(1_A\xi)=G_{0,r}(1_A\eta).$$

Moreover, η *coincides with the solution of BSDE (2.1) at time* r*. We then call* η *the conditional g-expectation of* ξ *under* $\mathcal{F}_r$ *and denote it by* $G_{r,T}(\xi)$*. Under the assumptions* (iii) *and* (iv) *of Theorem 2.9,* η *is unique.*

Proof. Let (y,z) be the solution of BSDE (2.1). $\forall A\in\mathcal{F}_r$, let $(\bar{y},\bar{z})$ be the solution of the following BSDE:

$$\bar{y}_t=\xi 1_A+\sum_{t\le s<T}f(s,\bar{y}_s,\bar{z}_s)-\sum_{t\le s<T}\bar{z}_s^*M_{s+1}. \tag{3.1}$$

By Assumption $(A3)$, we have

$$f(t,1_Ay,1_Az)=f(t,y,z)1_A,\forall t\ge 0.$$

Multiplying 1_A on both sides of BSDE (2.1), by the uniqueness of the solution of BSDE (3.1),

$$y_s1_A=\bar{y}_s,\forall s\in\{r,r+1,...,T\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Define

$$\eta\triangleq y_r.$$

By the definition of $G_{0,T}(1_A\xi)$ and (3.2), we have

$$G_{0,T}(1_A\xi)=\bar{y}_0=G_{0,r}(\bar{y}_r)=G_{0,r}(y_r1_A)=G_{0,r}(\eta 1_A).$$

It remains to prove η is unique. Assume that there exists another $\beta\in L^1(\mathcal{F}_r;R)$such that for any $A\in\mathcal{F}_r$,

$$G_{0,r}(\eta 1_A)=G_{0,r}(\beta 1_A) \tag{3.3}$$

and $P(\eta\neq\beta)>0$. Set $A=\{\eta\neq\beta\}$. It follows from corollary 2.10 that $G_{0,r}(\eta 1_A)\neq G_{0,r}(\beta 1_A)$, which is contrary to (3.3). The proof is complete. ■

Definition 3.3 *Under the assumptions (iii) and (iv) of Theorem 2.9, a real valued adapted process $\{U_t\}$ is called g-martingale (resp. super-martingale, sub-martingale), if $U_t\in L^1(\mathcal{F}_t;R)$, $\forall t,s\in\{0,1,...,T\}$, $t\leq s$,*

$$G_{t,s}(U_s)=U_t \text{ (resp. } \leq U_t,\ \ \geq U_t) \ P-a.s.$$

It is easy to check the following properties of $G_{\cdot,\cdot}(\cdot)$ (see [5] for more details).

Corollary 3.4 *Any g-martingale $\{U_t\}$ has the following basic properties:*
(1) *For each $0\leq t_1\leq t_2\leq t_3\leq T$, $G_{t_1,t_3}(U_{t_3})$=$G_{t_1,t_2}(G_{t_2,t_3}(U_{t_3}))$;*
(2) *(comparison theorem) If $U_s^1\leq U_s^2$, then $G_{t,s}(U_s^1)\leq G_{t,s}(U_s^2)$ for $0\leq t\leq s\leq T$;*
(3) *For any $A\in\mathcal{F}_t$, $G_{t,s}(1_A)=1_AG_{t,s}(1)$, $0\leq t\leq s\leq T$;*
(4) *Let $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n\subset\mathcal{F}_{t_0}$ be a partition of Ω, then for any $U_T^i\in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T;R)$, $i=1,2,...,n$, we have*

$$G_{t,T}(\sum_{i=1}^n U_T^i 1_{A_i})=\sum_{i=1}^n G_{t,T}(U_T^i)1_{A_i}, t\in\{t_0,t_0+1,...,T\}.$$

Now we study the Doob-Mayer Decomposition Theorem and optional sampling theorem under g-expectation. We first introduce a general type of g-martingale $G_{s,t}(\cdot;K)$ for each given process $K\in\mathcal{D}(0,t)$ where

$$\mathcal{D}(0,t)=\{\{\varphi_t,0\leq t\leq T\} \text{ is an } \mathcal{F}_t-\text{predictable real-valued process.}\}.$$

Consider

$$Y_s=X+K_\tau-K_{s\wedge\tau}+\sum_{s\wedge\tau\leq u<\tau}f(u,Y_u,Z_u)-\sum_{s\wedge\tau\leq u<\tau}Z_u^*M_{u+1}, 0\leq s\leq T \tag{3.4}$$

where $0\leq\sigma\leq\tau\leq T$ are stopping times, $X\in L^1(\mathcal{F}_\tau;R)$ and $K\in\mathcal{D}(0,t)$. Then we have the following theorem:

Theorem 3.5 *Under (A1) -(A3), for each given process $K\in\mathcal{D}(0,t)$, there exists a unique solution $(Y_s^{\tau,X,K},Z_s^{\tau,X,K})$ of BSDE (3.4).*

Proof. Define

$$\bar{Y}_s=Y_s+K_s,$$
$$\bar{f}(s,y,z)=f(s,y-K_s,z)1_{\{0,1,...,\tau\}}(s).$$

Considering the following BSDE

$$\bar{Y}_s = X + K_\tau + \sum_{s\leq u<T} \bar{f}(u, \bar{Y}_u, Z_u) - \sum_{s\leq u<T} Z_u^* M_{u+1}, 0 \leq s \leq T. \tag{3.5}$$

It is clear that $\bar{Y}_s \equiv X + K_s,\ Z_s \equiv 0$ on $\{\tau, \tau+1, ..., T\}$. Since $(X + K_\tau, \bar{f})$ satisfies the assumptions $(A1)$ -$(A3)$, BSDE (3.4) has a unique solution $(\bar{Y} - K, Z)$. ■

We denote

$$G_{\sigma,\tau}(X; K) = Y_\sigma^{\tau,X,K} \text{ and } G_{\sigma,\tau}(X) = G_{\sigma,\tau}(X; 0).$$

Here we will introduce the notion of $G(\cdot; K)$-martingale.

Definition 3.6 *Let $K \in \mathcal{D}(0,t)$ be given. An adapted process Y is said to be a $G(\cdot;K)$-martingale (resp. $G(\cdot;K)$-super-martingale, $G(\cdot;K)$-sub-martingale) on $\{t_0, t_0+1, ..., t_1\}$ if for each $t_0 \leq s \leq t \leq t_1$, we have*

$$G_{s,t}(Y_t; K) = Y_s \ (resp. \leq Y_s, \ \ \geq Y_s), \ P - a.s.$$

Theorem 3.7 (Doob-Mayer Decomposition Theorem) *Let U be a g-super-martingale. Then there exists a process $K \in \mathcal{D}(0,t)$ with $K_0 = 0$ such that $U_t = G_{t,T}(U_T; K), \forall t \in \{0, 1, 2, ..., T\}$, i.e., U is a $G(\cdot;K)$-martingale.*

Consider the following penalized BSDE:

$$u_t^n = U_T + \sum_{t\leq s<T} f(s, u_s^n, z_s^n) - \sum_{t\leq s<T} (z_s^n)^* M_{s+1} + n \sum_{t\leq s<T} (U_s - u_s^n)^+. \tag{3.6}$$

where $n \in \mathcal{Z}^+$.

Lemma 3.8 *We have $u_t^n \uparrow U_t, \ P - a.s.$*

Proof. Considering the one-step BSDE of (3.6):

$$u_t^n = U_{t+1} + n(U_t - u_t^n)^+ + f(u_t^n, z_t^n) - (z_t^n)^* M_{t+1}, \ n \in \mathcal{Z}^+. \tag{3.7}$$

Taking conditional expectation for (3.7), we get

$$u_t^n = E[U_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] + n(U_t - u_t^n)^+ + f(u_t^n, z_t^n), \ n \in \mathcal{Z}^+.$$

It follows that

$$(z_t^n)^* M_{t+1} = U_{t+1} - E[U_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t].$$

By martingale representation theorem in [18], there exists a unique Z_t such that the above equation is satisfied for arbitrary n. Then (3.7) can be rewritten as

$$u_t^n = U_{t+1} + n(U_t - u_t^n)^+ + f(u_t^n, Z_t) - Z_t^* M_{t+1}, \ n \in \mathcal{Z}^+. \tag{3.8}$$

On the set $\{U_t < u_t^n\}$, (3.8) becomes $u_t^n = U_{t+1} + f(u_t^n, Z_t) - Z_t^* M_{t+1}$ which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} u_t^n &= E[U_{t+1} + f(u_t^n, Z_t)|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &= E[G_{t,t+1}(U_{t+1})|\mathcal{F}_t] \\ &\leq U_t. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction. Thus, it is true that $u_t^n \leq U_t$, $P - a.s.$

By Comparison Theorem 2.9, it is easy to verify that $u_t^1 \leq u_t^2 \leq ... \leq U_t$. Similar to the arguments of Y_t^n in Theorem 2.11, we have that u_t^n is essentially bounded. Consequently $n(U_t - u_t^n)^+$ is also essentially bounded for an arbitrary n. Let $n \to \infty$, we have $u_t^n \uparrow U_t$, $P - a.s.$ ■

Proof. Now we complete the proof of Theorem **3.7.** Without loss of generality, we only consider the one-step BSDE. Define

$$K_t^n = n \sum_{0 \leq s < t} (U_s - u_s^n)^+ = n \sum_{0 \leq s < t} (U_s - u_s^n),$$

which is predictable and non-decreasing in t. Then u_t^n has the following expression

$$u_t^n = U_{t+1} + K_{t+1}^n - K_t^n + f(u_t^n, Z_t) - Z_t^* M_{t+1},\ n \in \mathcal{Z}^+.$$

We rewrite (3.6) in the following forward form:

$$u_t^n = u_0^n - K_t^n - \sum_{0 \leq s < t} f(u_t^n, Z_t) - \sum_{0 \leq s < t} Z_t^* M_{t+1},\ n \in \mathcal{Z}^+.$$

It follows that

$$K_t^n = -u_t^n + u_0^n - \sum_{0 \leq s < t} f(u_t^n, Z_t) - \sum_{0 \leq s < t} Z_t^* M_{t+1}, n \in \mathcal{Z}^+.$$

By lemma 3.8, we have k_t^n is convergent as $n \to \infty$. Denote

$$K_t = \lim_{n \to \infty} K_t^n.$$

(3.8) becomes

$$U_t = U_{t+1} + K_{t+1} - K_t + f(U_t, Z_t) - Z_t^* M_{t+1},$$

as $n \to \infty$. Thus, $U_t = G_{t,t+1}(U_{t+1}; K)$. This completes the proof. ■

In the following, we study the optional sampling theorem for g-super and g-sub-martingale in our framework.

For a given $U \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_\tau; R)$ and two stopping times σ and τ taking values in $\{0, 1, ..., T\}$,define

$$G_{\sigma,\tau}(U) = Y_\sigma$$

where Y_σ is the solution of the following BSDE

$$Y_\sigma = U + \sum_{\sigma \wedge \tau \leq u < \tau} f(u, Y_u, Z_u) - \sum_{\sigma \wedge \tau \leq u < \tau} Z_u^* M_{u+1}$$

at time σ.

Lemma 3.9 *Let τ be a stopping time and (U_t) be a g-super-martingale. Then for each $t \in \{0, 1, ..., T\}$, we have*

$$G_{t,\tau}(U_\tau) \leq U_{\tau \wedge t}, \ P - a.s. \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. We first consider that $t \geq T-1$. Note that in this case $\tau = \tau 1_{\{\tau \leq T-1\}} + T1_{\{\tau = T\}}$.

$$\begin{aligned} G_{t,\tau}(U_\tau) &= G_{t,\tau}(U_T 1_{\{\tau=T\}} + U_\tau 1_{\{\tau \leq T-1\}}) \\ &= 1_{\{\tau=T\}} G_{t,T}(U_T) + U_\tau 1_{\{\tau \leq T-1\}} \\ &\leq 1_{\{\tau=T\}} U_t + U_\tau 1_{\{\tau \leq T-1\}} = U_{\tau \wedge t}. \end{aligned}$$

Particularly, we have $G_{T-1,\tau}(U_\tau) \leq U_{\tau \wedge (T-1)}$. For $t = i$, $i < T-1$, we can repeatedly use the above procedure, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} G_{t,\tau}(U_\tau) = G_{t,T-1}(G_{T-1,\tau}(U_\tau)) \leq G_{t,\tau\wedge(T-1)}(U_{\tau\wedge(T-1)}) \leq ... &\leq G_{t,\tau\wedge i+1}(U_{\tau \wedge i+1}) \\ &\leq U_{\tau \wedge i} = U_{\tau \wedge t}. \end{aligned}$$

Thiscompletes the proof. ■

The time t in (3.9) can also be replaced by a stopping time σ.

Proposition 3.10 *Let τ and σ be stopping times and (U_t) be a g-super-martingale. Then, we have*

$$G_{\sigma,\tau}(U_\tau) \leq U_{\tau \wedge \sigma}, P - a.s..$$

Proof. From (3.9), we have

$$G_{\sigma,\tau}(U_\tau) = \sum_{i=0}^{T} G_{i,\tau}(U_\tau) 1_{\{\sigma=i\}} \leq \sum_{i=0}^{T} (U_{\tau\wedge i}) 1_{\{\sigma=i\}} = U_{\tau\wedge\sigma}.$$

■

Finally, we have the following Optional Sampling Theorem.

Theorem 3.11 *(Optional Sampling Theorem) Let τ and σ be stopping times such that $\sigma \leq \tau$ and (U_t) be a g-martingale (resp. g-super-martingale, g-sub-martingale). Then, we have*

$$G_{\sigma,\tau}(U_\tau) = U_\sigma \ (resp. \ \leq U_\sigma, \ \geq U_\sigma), \ P - a.s.$$

3.2 Multiple prior martingales and g-Martingales

Riedel [31] developed a theory of optimal stopping under multiple priors. He defined the multiple prior martingale (U_t) if it satisfies

$$U_t = ess \inf_{p \in \Lambda} E^p[U_{t+1} | \mathcal{F}_t],$$

where Λ is the set of time-consistent priors.

In this subsection, we will study special cases of the multiple prior martingales based on the RBSDE theory.

We denote by $\mathcal{Q}$ the set of all probability measures $Q \sim P$. For any $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, set

$$W_t := E[\frac{dQ}{dP}|\mathcal{F}_t].$$

Then W_t is a martingale. By Martingale Representation Theorem in [9], there exists an adapted process z such that

$$W_t = 1 + \sum_{0 \le s < t} z_s^* M_{s+1}.$$

Let $\theta_t \triangleq \frac{z_t^*}{W_t}$. We have

$$W_t = \prod_{0 \le s < t} (1 + \theta_s M_{s+1})$$

and

$$\frac{dQ}{dP} = W_T = \prod_{0 \le s < T} (1 + \theta_s M_{s+1}). \tag{3.10}$$

Thus, for any $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$, $\frac{dQ}{dP}$ can be generated by (θ_t) through (3.10). The probability measure generated by (θ_t) is denoted by Q^θ.

Consider the following set of probability measures

$$\mathcal{B} = \{Q^\theta \in \mathcal{Q} \mid |\theta_t^i| \le \frac{k}{var(X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t)},\ t = 0, \ldots, T-1,\ i = 1, \ldots, m\}, \tag{3.11}$$

where $0 < k < \frac{1}{2} var(X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t)$ and

$$var(X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t) \triangleq E[X_{t+1}^* X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] - E[X_{t+1}^*|\mathcal{F}_t] E[X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] > 0.$$

Definition 3.12 *Suppose* $\xi \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T; R)$. *Let*

$$G(\xi) = \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{B}} \{E_Q[\xi]\}; \quad G(\xi|\mathcal{F}_t) = ess \inf_{Q \in \mathcal{B}} \{E_Q[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t]\}, 0 \le t \le T.$$

Then we call $G(\xi)$ *and* $G(\xi|\mathcal{F}_t)$ *minimum expectation and minimal conditional expectation respectively of* ξ *about* $\mathcal{B}$. *Similarly, we can define the corresponding maximum expectation and maximal conditional expectation, respectively.*

Suppose $\xi \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T; R)$,$k$ is the constant in (3.11) and (y_t, z_t) be the solution of the following BSDE:

$$y_t = \xi - \sum_{t \le s < T} \sum_{1 \le i \le m} k|z_s^i| - \sum_{t \le s < T} z_s^* M_{s+1}. \tag{3.12}$$

Or equivalently,

$$y_t = y_{t+1} - \sum_{1 \le i \le m} k|z_s^i| - z_t^* M_{t+1}, y_T = \xi.$$

Then we have the following relation between minimum expectation and g-expectation.

Theorem 3.13 *Under* (H)*, suppose* $\xi \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T; R)$*, k is the constant in (3.11) and* $var(X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t) > 0$*. Then we have*

$$G(\xi) = G_{0,T}^{-k}(\xi),\ G(\xi|\mathcal{F}_t) = G_{t,T}^{-k}(\xi),$$

where $G_{\cdot,\cdot}^{-k}(\cdot)$ *denotes the corresponding solution of BSDE generated by* $f(t, y, z) = -\sum_{1\le i\le m} k|z_t^i|$*.*

Proof. For a given $\xi \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T; R)$, by the existence and uniqueness theorem in [9], we know BSDE (3.12) has a unique solution (y_t, z_t). Let

$$\theta_s^i = -k(sgnz_s^i),\ 1 \le i \le m.$$

Then (3.12) can be rewritten as

$$y_t = \xi - \sum_{t\le s<T} z_s^* \tilde{M}_{s+1},$$

where $\tilde{M}_{s+1} = M_{s+1} - \theta_s$.

Consider the one-step equation:

$$y_t = y_{t+1} - z_t^* \tilde{M}_{t+1},\ y_T = \xi.$$

Suppose Q^a is the probability measure generated by (a_t) where

$$a_t = \frac{\theta_t}{var(X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t)}.$$

We can show that $\tilde{M}_{t+1}$ is a martingale difference process under Q^a as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
& X_{t+1} - E^{Q^a}[X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] \\
= \ & X_{t+1} - E[X_{t+1}(1 + M_{t+1}^* \tfrac{\theta_t}{var(X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t)})|\mathcal{F}_t] \\
= \ & X_{t+1} - E[X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] - E[X_{t+1}^*(X_{t+1} - E[X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t])|\mathcal{F}_t] \tfrac{\theta_t}{var(X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t)} \\
= \ & X_{t+1} - E[X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] - \theta_s \\
= \ & \tilde{M}_{t+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$E_{Q^a}[\tilde{M}_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] = 0.$$

Consequently, $E_{Q^a}[z_t^* \tilde{M}_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] = 0$. So we have

$$y_t = E_{Q^a}[y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] \ge ess \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{B}} E_Q[y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t].$$

On the other hand, suppose $Q^\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ which is generated by (β_t). Define

$$\theta_t = \beta_t var(X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t),$$

Consider the following linear BSDE:

$$y_t^\theta = \xi - \sum_{t\leq s<T} \theta_s z_s - \sum_{t\leq s<T} z_s^* M_{s+1}; \tag{3.13}$$

Or the one-step equation

$$y_t^\theta = y_{t+1}^\theta - \theta_t z_t - z_t^* M_{t+1}. \tag{3.14}$$

Similarly to the above arguments, we obtain

$$y_t^\theta = E_{Q^\beta}[y_{t+1}^\theta|\mathcal{F}_t].$$

Moreover, note that

$$-\theta_t^i z^i \geq -k|z^i|, \ \forall (z,t) \in R^m \times \{0,1,...,T-1\}.$$

Applying Comparison Theorem, we have

$$y_t^\theta \geq y_t$$

which yields to

$$E_{Q^\beta}[y_{t+1}^\theta|\mathcal{F}_t] = E_{Q^\beta}[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t] \geq y_t.$$

Thus,

$$ess \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{B}} E_Q[y_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t] \geq y_t.$$

Finally, we have

$$y_t = ess \inf_{Q\in\mathcal{B}} E_Q[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t].$$

It is clear that the theorem holds when $t = 0$. ■

Remark 3.14 *The condition* $var(X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t) > 0$ *in Theorem 3.13 guarantees that* $\tilde{M}_t$ *is also a martingale difference process. Usual processes, such as the standard random walk etc., satisfy this condition.*

The multiple prior set $\mathcal{B}$ defined by (3.11) is time-consistent in the sense of [31].

Proposition 3.15 *$\mathcal{B}$ is time-consistent.*

Proof. Let $Q^a \in \mathcal{B}$ be the probability measure generated by (a_t).

As in the proof of Theorem 3.13, we can define

$$\frac{dQ^a}{dP}|_{\mathcal{F}_{t+1}}^t = 1 + a_t M_{t+1}$$

as the corresponding "one step" Radon-Nikodym derivative from t to $t+1$. Then

$$\frac{dQ^a}{dP} = \prod_{0\le s<T}(1+a_sM_{s+1}) = \prod_{0\le s<T}\frac{dQ^a}{dP}|^s_{\mathcal{F}_{s+1}},$$

and

$$\frac{dQ^a}{dP}|^t_{\mathcal{F}_s} = \prod_{t\le u<s}(1+a_uM_{u+1}) = \prod_{t\le u<s}\frac{dQ^a}{dP}|^u_{\mathcal{F}_{u+1}}, \quad 0\le t<s\le T.$$

For a given $Q^b\in\mathcal{B}$, let (p_t) and (q_t) be the density process of Q^a and Q^b with respect to P respectively, i.e.

$$p_t = \frac{dQ^a}{dP}|^0_{\mathcal{F}_t}, \quad q_t = \frac{dQ^b}{dP}|^0_{\mathcal{F}_t}.$$

For a given stopping time τ, define a new probability measure R as follows:

$$\frac{dR}{dP}|^0_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \begin{cases} p_t & \text{if} \quad 0<t\le\tau; \\ \frac{p_\tau q_t}{q_\tau} & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

It remains to verify that R belongs to $\mathcal{B}$ as well.

It is easy to show that

$$\frac{dR}{dP}|^0_{\mathcal{F}_t} = \prod_{0\le u<\tau}(1+a_uM_{u+1})\cdot\prod_{\tau\le u<t}(1+b_uM_{u+1}).$$

Define

$$c_t = \begin{cases} a_t & \text{if } 0<t\le\tau \\ b_t & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Then,

$$|c_t^i| \le \frac{k}{var(X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t)}, \ i=1,\cdots,m.$$

Thus, we have $R\in\mathcal{B}$. ■

The corresponding results in continuous time model is called k-ignorance in [4]. Now we extend our results to a more general multiple prior set.

Let

$$K\subset\{x \mid x\in R^m \text{ and } \parallel x\parallel < \frac{1}{2}\}$$

be a compact and convex set. Define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}} = \{Q^\theta\in\mathcal{Q} \mid \theta_t\in K, \ t=0,\ldots,T-1\}.$$

Consider the BSDE

$$Y_t = -\sum_{t\le s<T}[-f(s,Y_s)+e(Z_s)] - \sum_{t\le s<T}Z_s^*M_{s+1},$$

where $e(\cdot)$ is the support function for K defined by

$$e(x) = \max_{y \in K}(y \cdot x), \quad x \in R^m.$$

Similar to studying the k-ignorance model, we obtain

$$Y_t = ess \inf_{Q \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}} E_Q[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t].$$

3.3 Application to k-ignorance model

Riedel [31] considered the optimal stopping problem under ambiguity as follows:

$$\text{maximize } \inf_{P \in \mathcal{C}} E^P U_\tau \quad \text{over all stopping times} \quad \tau \leq T$$

for a finite horizon $T < \infty$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of priors and $(U_t)_{t \in \mathcal{N}}$ is an essentially bounded and adapted process.

To solve the above problem, Riedel [31] introduced the multiple prior Snell envelope $\bar{U}$ defined by $\bar{U}_T = U_T$ and

$$\bar{U}_t = \max\{U_t, ess \inf_{P \in \mathcal{C}} E^P[\bar{U}_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]\}, \ t \in \{0, 1, ..., T-1\}.$$

Now we study the relation between multiple prior Snell envelope and RBSDEs for the k-ignorance case.

Consider the following RBSDE:

$$\begin{cases} \bar{U}_t = \bar{U}_{t+1} - k|Z_t| - Z_t^* M_{t+1} + K_{t+1} - K_t \\ \bar{U}_T = U_T, \bar{U}_t \geq U_t \\ (\bar{U}_t - U_t)(K_{t+1} - K_t) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{3.15}$$

where k is the constant in (3.11).

By Theorem 2.11, (3.15) has a unique solution $(\bar{U}_t, Z_t, K_t)$.

Theorem 3.16 *Under (H), suppose $U_T \in L^1(\mathcal{F}_T; R)$ and $var(X_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t) > 0$. Then the solution $\bar{U}_t$ of (3.15) is the multiple prior Snell envelope of U with multiple prior set $\mathcal{B}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.17, we know

$$\bar{U}_t = U_t \vee (-k \sum_{i=1}^m |Z_t^i| + E[\bar{U}_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t])$$

where $Z_t^* M_{t+1} = \bar{U}_{t+1} - E[\bar{U}_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]$. Then consider the following BSDE:

$$y_t = \bar{U}_{t+1} - k \sum_{i=1}^m |z_t^i| - z_t^* M_{t+1}.$$

It follows that

$$y_t = -k\sum_{i=1}^{m}|z_t^i| + E[\bar{U}_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t],$$

where $z_t^* M_{t+1} = \bar{U}_{t+1} - E[\bar{U}_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]$.

Then by (H), we have $Z_t = z_t$ $P-a.s.$, i.e.

$$y_t = -k\sum_{i=1}^{m}|Z_t^i| + E[\bar{U}_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t].$$

By Theorem 3.13, we have $y_t = ess\inf_{P\in\mathcal{B}} E^P[\bar{U}_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]$.

Thus, we have

$$\bar{U}_t = U_t \vee (ess\inf_{P\in\mathcal{B}} E^P[\bar{U}_{t+1}|\mathcal{F}_t]).$$

This completes the proof. ■

By the above theorem and Proposition 2.13 as well as other properties of RBSDEs, we can deduce the following useful results:

(i) $\bar{U}$ is the smallest multiple prior super-martingale with respect to $\mathcal{B}$ which dominates U;

(ii) $\bar{U}$ is the value process of the following optimal stopping problem under ambiguity, i.e.

$$\bar{U}_t = ess\sup_{\tau\in\mathcal{J}_t} ess\inf_{P\in\mathcal{B}} E^P[U_\tau|\mathcal{F}_t];$$

(iii) an optimal stopping rule can be given by

$$\tau^* = \inf\{t \geq 0 : \bar{U}_t = U_t\}.$$

Now we reconsider a simple example which was discussed in [26] and [6].

Example 3.17 *Suppose the value process of an asset is governed by*

$$\begin{cases} Y_{t+1} - Y_t = bY_t + \sigma Y_t(M_{t+1} - M_t) \\ Y_0 = y > 0, \end{cases} \tag{3.16}$$

where σ, $b > 0$ *are given constants. We want to find the optimal time* $\tau* \in \{0, 1, ..., T\}$ *to sell this asset.*

We first suppose that there does not exist ambiguity and the risk only comes from the martingale difference process. This problem can be formulated as follows:

$$\sup_{0\leq\tau\leq T} E[Y_\tau].$$

From (3.16), we know

$$E[Y_{t+1} - Y_t] = bE[Y_t].$$

Since $Y_0 = y > 0$, *we have* $E[Y_1] > Y_0 > 0$. *It is easy to see that* $E[Y_{t+1}] \geq E[Y_t] > 0$. *Thus, the optimal time is* $\tau^* = T$, *which implies that the owner is better to hold this asset until the maturity time* T.

Now if there exists ambiguity, which can be described by a family of probability measures:

$$\frac{dQ^\theta}{dP} := \prod_{0\le t<T}(1+\theta_t M_{t+1})$$

where θ^i *is a process taking values in* $(-\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$*. Then an ambiguity averse decision maker want to solve*

$$\sup_{\tau\in\{0,1,\ldots,T\}}\inf_{\theta} E^{Q^\theta}[Y_\tau].$$

This problem can be transferred to solve the following RBSDE:

$$\begin{cases}\bar{U}_t = \bar{U}_{t+1} - \sum_{i=1}^m |Z_t^i| - Z_t^* M_{t+1} + K_{t+1} - K_t\\ \bar{U}_T = Y_T, \bar{U}_t \ge Y_t\\ (\bar{U}_t - Y_t)(K_{t+1}-K_t) = 0.\end{cases}$$

By the Proposition 2.13, we know

$$\tau^* = \inf\{t \le u \le T; \bar{U}_u = Y_u\}$$

and

$$\tau^* = T \text{ if } \bar{U}_u > Y_u, \quad t \le u \le T.$$

Acknowledgements The authors would like to thank Prof. Shige Peng and Frank Riedel for some useful conversations in the stochastic game workshop in China (November 2012).

References

[1] Bouchard, B. and Touzi, N. (2004). *Discrete-time approximation and Monte-Carlo simulation of backward stochastic differential equations.* Applied Stochastic Processes. **111** 175–206.

[2] Bahlali, K., Hamadene, S. and Mezerdi, B. (2005). *BSDEs with two reflecting barriers and quadratic growth coefficient.* Stochastic Processes and their Applications **115** 1107-1129.

[3] Briand, P. and Delyon, B. and Memin, J. (2001). *Donsker-type theorem for BSDEs.* Electronic Communications in Probability. **6** 1–14.

[4] Chen, Z. and Epstein, L. (2002). *Ambiguity, risk, and asset returns in continuous time.* Econometrica. **70(4)** 1403–1443.

[5] Chen, Z. and Peng, S. (2001). *Continuous properties of g-martingales.* Chinese Annals of Mathematics. **22B(1)** 115–128.

[6] Cheng, X. and Riedel, F. (2013) Optimal Stopping Under Ambiguity in Continuous Time, Mathematics and Financial Economics 7(1) 29-68.

[7] Cohen, S. N. and Elliott, R. J. (2008). *Solutions of Backward Stochastic Differential Equations on Markov Chains.* Communications on Stochastic Analysis. **2(2)** 251–262.

[8] Cohen, S. N. and Elliott, R. J. (2010). *Comparisons for backward stochastic differential equations on markov chains and reflected no-arbitrage conditions.* Annals of Applied Probability. **20(1)** 267–311.

[9] Cohen, S. N. and Elliott, R. J. (2010). *A general theory of finite state backward stochastic difference equations* . Stochastic Processes and their Applications. **120** 442–466.

[10] Cohen, S. N. and Elliott, R. J. (2011). *Backward stochastic difference equations and nearly time-consistent nonlinear expectations.* SIAM J. Control Optim. 49 (1) 125–139.

[11] Cohen, S. N., Elliott, R. J., Pardoux, E., and Pearce, C. E. M.(2008). *A Ring Isomorphism and corresponding Pseudoinverses.* arXiv:0810.0093.

[12] Cohen, S. N. and Hu, Y. (2012). *Ergodic BSDEs driven by Markov Chains,* arXiv:1207.5680.

[13] Coquet, F., Hu, Y., Memin J. and Peng, S. (2002). *Filtration Consistent Nonlinear Expectations and Related g-Expectations.* Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 123 1-27.

[14] Cvitanic J. and Karatzas I. (1996) *Backward stochastic diffential equations with reflection and Dynkin games.* Ann. Probab. 24, 2024-2056.

[15] El Karoui, N., Kapoudjan, C., Pardoux, E., Peng, S. and Quenez, M.C.(1997). *Reflected solutions of backward SDE's, and related obstacle problem for PDE's.* Annals of Probability. **25(2)** 702–737.

[16] El Karoui, N. , Pardoux, E. and Quenez, M. C. (1997). *Reflected backward SDEs and American options.* Numerical Methods in Finance [M], Cambridge: Publications of the Newton Institute, Cambridge University Press. 215–231.

[17] El Karoui, N. , Peng, S. and Quenez, M. C. (1997). *Backward stochastic differential equations in finance. Math. Finance. 7(1) 1-71.*

[18] Elliott, R. J. and Yang, H. (1994). *How to count and guess well: Discrete adaptive filters.* Applied Mathematics and Optimization. **30(1)** 51–78.

[19] Hamadene S. (2002). *Reflected BSDEs with discontinuous barrier and application.* Stochastics Rep. 74, 571-596.

[20] Hamadene S., Lepeltier J. and Matoussi A. (1997). *Double barriers reflected backward SDEs with continuous coefficients.* Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series 364, 115-128, Longman (Eds : N.E-K. & L.M.) .

[21] Hu, Y. and Tang, S. (2010). *Multi-dimensional BSDE with oblique reflection and optimal switching.* Probab. Theory Related Fields 147(1-2) 89–121.

[22] Lepeltier J. and Xu M. (2005). *Penalization method for reflected backward stochastic differenctial equations with one R.C.L.L. barrier.* Statistics & Probability Letters 75, 58-66.

[23] Lepeltier, J. and Xu, M. (2007). *Reflected backward stochastic differential equations with two RCLL barriers.* ESAIM Probab. Stat. 11 3–22.

[24] Ma, J. , Protter, P., Martin, S. and Torres, S. (2002). *Numerical method for backward stochastic differential equations.* Annals of Probability. **12(1)** 302–316.

[25] Matoussi A. (1997). *Reflected solutions of BSDEs with continuous coefficient.* Statistics and Probability Letters 34, 347-354.

[26] Oksendal, B. (2000). *Stochastic Diffrential Equations-An Introduction with Applications*, Fifth ed. Springer-Verlag.

[27] Pardoux, E. and Peng, S. (1990). *Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation.* Systems and Control Letters. **14** 55–61.

[28] Peng, S.(1997). *Backward Stochastic differential equations and related g-expectations.* Backward Stochastic Differential Equations, El Karoui, N. and Mazliak, L. (eds.). Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics series, Longman Harlow. **364** 141–159.

[29] Peng, S. (1999). *Monotonic limit theorem of BSDE and nonlinear decomposition theorem of Doob-Mayer.* Probability Theory and Related Fields. **113** 473–499.

[30] Revuz, D. and Yor, M. (1994). *Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion.* Springer, New York. 239–240.

[31] Riedel, F. (2009). *Optimal Stopping with Multiple Priors.* Econometrica. **77(3)** 857–908.